

In the matter of the General Data Protection Regulation

DPC Complaint Reference: [REDACTED]

IMI Complaint Reference Number: [REDACTED]

In the matter of a complaint, lodged by [REDACTED] with the Austrian Data Protection Authority pursuant to Article 77 of the General Data Protection Regulation, concerning Microsoft Ireland Operations Limited

Record of Amicable Resolution of the complaint and its consequent withdrawal pursuant to Section 109(3) of the Data Protection Act, 2018

Further to the requirements of EDPB Guidelines 06/2022 on the practical implementation of amicable settlements Version 2.0 (adopted on 12 May 2022)

**RECORD OF AMICABLE RESOLUTION FOR THE
PURPOSE OF EDPB GUIDELINES 06/2022 ON THE
PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF AMICABLE
SETTLEMENTS VERSION 2.0, ADOPTED 12 MAY 2022**

Dated the 15th day of December 2022



Data Protection Commission
21 Fitzwilliam Square South
Dublin 2, Ireland

Background

1. On 17 March 2021, [REDACTED] (“**the Data Subject**”) lodged a complaint pursuant to Article 77 GDPR with the Austrian Data Protection Authority (“**the Recipient SA**”) concerning Microsoft Ireland Operations Limited (“**the Respondent**”).
2. In circumstances where the Data Protection Commission (“**the DPC**”) was deemed to be the competent authority for the purpose of Article 56(1) GDPR, the Recipient SA transferred the complaint to the DPC on 21 May 2021.

The Complaint

3. The details of the complaint were as follows:
 - a. The Data Subject contacted the Respondent following a hack of their account. The Data Subject requested for the account in question to be blocked, and subsequently deleted.
 - b. The Data Subject did not receive any response from the Respondent.

Action taken by the DPC

4. The DPC, pursuant to Section 109(4) of the Data Protection Act, 2018 (“**the 2018 Act**”), is required, as a preliminary matter, to assess the likelihood of the parties to the complaint reaching, within a reasonable time, an amicable resolution of the subject-matter of the complaint. Where the DPC considers that there is a reasonable likelihood of such an amicable resolution being concluded between the parties, it is empowered, by Section 109(2) of the 2018 Act, to take such steps as it considers appropriate to arrange or facilitate such an amicable resolution.
5. Following a preliminary examination of the material referred to it by the Recipient SA, the DPC considered that there was a reasonable likelihood of the parties concerned reaching, within a reasonable time, an amicable resolution of the subject matter of the complaint. The DPC’s experience is that complaints of this nature are particularly suitable for amicable resolution in circumstances where there is an obvious solution to the dispute, if the respondent is willing to engage in the process. In this regard, the DPC had regard to:
 - a. The relationship between the Data Subject and Respondent being, in this case, an individual consumer and a service provider; and
 - b. The nature of the complaint in this case, an unsuccessful attempt by the Data Subject to exercise his/her data subject rights.
6. While not relevant to the assessment that the DPC is required to carry out pursuant to Section 109(4) of the 2018 Act, the DPC also had regard to EDPB Guidelines 06/2022 on the practical

implementation of amicable settlements Version 2.0, adopted on 12 May 2022 (“**Document 06/2022**”), and considered that:

- a. the possible conclusion of the complaint by way of amicable resolution would not hamper the ability of the supervisory authorities to maintain the high level of protection that the GDPR seeks to create; and that
- b. such a conclusion, in this case, would likely carry advantages for the Data Subject, whose rights under the GDPR would be vindicated swiftly, as well as for the controller, who would be provided the opportunity to bring its behaviour into compliance with the GDPR.

Amicable Resolution

7. The DPC engaged with both the Data Subject (via the Recipient SA) and Respondent in relation to the subject-matter of the complaint. Further to that engagement, it was established that the Respondent requires proof of account ownership prior to suspending an account. In the circumstances, the Respondent agreed to take the following actions:
 - a. The Respondent agreed to permanently suspend the account; and
 - b. To migrate the existing licences owned by the Data Subject to the new account.
8. On 15 October 2021, the DPC outlined the Data Subject’s complaint to the Respondent. The DPC noted in its correspondence that the Data Subject’s issue appeared to be a customer service failure to transfer software licences to a new account. In its correspondence to the Respondent, the DPC noted that the complaint also contained access and erasure requests. The DPC highlighted that it would only address the access and erasure elements of the complaint.
9. On 1 November 2021, the Respondent wrote to the DPC. In its correspondence to the DPC the Respondent stated that, according to its records, the Data Subject had contacted the Respondent requesting that their account be blocked due to an account hack, and that it be deleted. The Respondent noted that it advised the Data Subject that they could access their personal data and their account could be closed by using its self-service tools. The Respondent further noted that self-service tools are designed in order to verify the Data Subject’s ownership of the data through authenticating their account.
10. The Respondent informed the DPC that the Data Subject was able to successfully confirm their account ownership. The Respondent confirmed to the DPC that it had permanently suspended the Data Subject’s account and that their licences had been migrated to a new account as requested.
11. The DPC wrote to the Data Subject on 31 December 2021, outlining the Respondent’s response. When doing so, the DPC noted that, the requested account having been permanently suspended and the licences transferred to another account, the dispute

between the Data Subject and Respondent appeared to have been resolved. In the circumstances, the DPC asked the Data Subject to notify it, within two months, if they were not satisfied with the outcome, so that the DPC could take further action. The DPC did not receive any further communication from the Data Subject and, accordingly, the complaint has been deemed to have been amicably resolved.

12. On 4 August 2022, and in light of the foregoing, the DPC wrote to the Recipient SA noting that the DPC considered the complaint to have been amicably resolved and withdrawn in accordance with section 109(3) of the Act and that it would conclude the case and inform the Respondent.
13. In circumstances where the subject-matter of the complaint has been amicably resolved, in full, the complaint, by virtue of Section 109(3) of the 2018 Act, is deemed to have been withdrawn by the Data Subject.

Confirmation of Outcome

14. For the purpose of Document 06/2022, the DPC confirms that:
 - a. The complaint, in its entirety, has been amicably resolved between the parties concerned;
 - b. The agreed resolution is such that the object of the complaint no longer exists; and
 - c. Having consulted with the supervisory authorities concerned on the information set out above, as required by Document 06/2022 the DPC has now closed off its file in this matter.
15. If dissatisfied with the outcome recorded herein, the parties have the right to an effective remedy by way of an application for judicial review, by the Irish High Court, of the process applied by the DPC in the context of the within complaint.

Signed for and on behalf of the DPC:



Deputy Commissioner

Data Protection Commission